arXiv:1606.01225v1 [hep-ph] 3 Jun 2016

A vector-like extension of the standard model in which the vacuum spontaneously breaks parity

Kevin Cahill*

Department of Physics & Astronomy, University of New Mexico,

Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131, USA and

School of Computational Sciences,

Korea Institute for Advanced Study,

Seoul 130-722, Korea

(Dated: June 6, 2016)

Abstract

To be compatible with general relativity, every fundamental theory should be invariant under general coordinate transformations including spatial reflection. This paper describes a simple extension of the standard model in which the action is invariant under spatial reflection, and the vacuum spontaneously breaks parity by giving a mean value to a pseudoscalar field. This field and a scalar Higgs field make the gauge bosons, the known fermions, and a set of mirror fermions suitably massive while avoiding flavor-changing neutral currents. In this vector-like model, there is no strong-CP problem, there are no anomalies, fermion number is conserved, and heavy mirror fermions form heavy neutral mirror atoms that are dark-matter candidates. The pseudoscalar field whose mean value breaks parity could have a mass of 750 GeV and decay into two photons. In many grandly unified extensions of the model, nucleons slowly decay into pions, antileptons, and neutrinos in processes like $p \to \pi^+ + 3\nu$, $p \to e^+ + 4\nu$, and $n \to 3\nu$ that conserve fermion number.

* kevinecahill@gmail.com

I. INTRODUCTION

Invariance under general coordinate transformations is the defining principle of general relativity. Although other theories of gravity do exist [1], I will assume in this paper that particle physics is compatible with general relativity and has an action that is invariant under general coordinate transformations and in particular under reflection of the spatial coordinates. The paper describes an extension of the standard model in which the action is invariant under spatial reflection, and the vacuum spontaneously breaks parity by giving a nonzero mean value to a pseudoscalar field. This field and a scalar Higgs field make the gauge bosons, the known fermions, and a set of mirror fermions suitably massive while avoiding flavor-changing neutral currents. In this vector-like model, gauge fields act on four-component Dirac fields, there is no strong-CP problem, there are no anomalies, fermion number is conserved, and heavy mirror fermions form heavy neutral mirror atoms that are dark-matter candidates. In many grandly unified extensions of the model, nucleons slowly decay in processes that conserve fermion number such as $p \to \pi^+ + 3\nu$, $p \to e^+ + 4\nu$, and $n \to 3\nu$.

In the standard model, the strong and electromagnetic gauge bosons act on four-component Dirac spinors, but those of $SU_L(2)$ act on two-component left-handed spinors. This awkward feature breaks parity and general-coordinate invariance at the level of the action. Actions that break parity invite anomalies and admit the pseudoscalar term $\epsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma\tau} F^a_{\mu\nu} F^a_{\sigma\tau}$ which leads to the strong-CP problem. Another reason to prefer theories that conserve parity is that in space-times of odd dimension, rotational invariance implies invariance under reflection of the spatial coordinates; most string theories are not chiral [2].

The left-handedness of the weak interactions led Pati and Salam [3], Georgi and Glashow [4], and very many others to use two-component left-handed fermion fields exclusively in their theories of grand unification. They represented right-handed fermions as left-handed antifermions, put quarks and antiquarks in the same multiplet, predicted low-order proton decay, and shifted the focus of particle physics higher in energy by 12 orders of magnitude.

A theory whose action conserves parity with gauge fields acting on four-component spinors becomes invariant under general coordinate transformations when decorated with tetrads and Christoffel symbols, is free of anomalies, and avoids the problem of strong-CP violation because the invariance of its action under space reflection forbids the appearance of the

pseudoscalar $\epsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma\tau}F^a_{\mu\nu}F^a_{\sigma\tau}$. In the models of this paper, fermion number

$$f = q + \ell \tag{1}$$

taken to be quark number plus lepton number is conserved, each family has two neutrinos, and heavy mirror fermions form heavy, neutral mirror atoms that are dark-matter candidates. These are some of the advantages of vector-like theories in which gauge fields act exclusively on four-component Dirac (or Majorana) spinors.

At energies exceeding those of the heavy mirror fermions, parity is restored in these models. The lower limits on heavy quarks are 735 GeV for $t_3 = \frac{1}{2}$ and 755 GeV for $t_3 = -\frac{1}{2}$ [5]. The lower limits on heavy charged and neutral leptons respectively are 101.9 GeV and 80.5–101.5 GeV [6]. The restoration of parity may occur at tens of TeV.

The pseudoscalar field whose mean value breaks parity could have a mass of 750 GeV and decay into two photons as seen by ATLAS and CMS [7].

In some grandly unified extensions of these models, nucleons slowly decay by processes such as $p \to \pi^+ + 3\nu$, $p \to e^+ + 4\nu$, and $n \to 3\nu$ that conserve fermion number $q+\ell$ but violate baryon number minus lepton number. The partial lifetimes of these decays rise with the 12th power of the heavy masses of the mediating gauge bosons $\tau_N \sim M^{12}/(\alpha_u^4 m_p^{13})$ in which α_u is the fine-structure constant of the unified theory. The lower bounds on such partial lifetimes are 4.9×10^{26} years for $n \to 3\nu$ [8], 5.8×10^{29} years for $n \to$ invisible [9], and 2.1×10^{29} years for $p \to$ invisible [10], so the masses of the mediating gauge bosons should exceed about a PeV. Such nucleon-decay events may lurk in SNO, KamLAND, Super-Kamiokande, or JUNO data. The residual $^{15}\mathrm{N}^*$ or $^{15}\mathrm{O}^*$ emits a γ ray of 6–7 MeV. The energy scale of 1 PeV is 9 or 10 orders of magnitude lower than that of traditional grand unification.

The present models imply the existence of heavy mirror fermions with interactions much like those of the known fermions, but with right-handed weak interactions. They would form very heavy positive nuclei surrounded by shells of heavy mirror electrons with $m_{e'} \gg m_e$. These mirror atoms would be very small with Bohr radii of the order of $(\alpha m_{e'})^{-1}$. The energy needed to excite these atoms would be of the order of $m_{e'}\alpha^2$, so these atoms would interact only with photons of 100 MeV or more. These atoms are candidates for dark matter. Because their masses would exceed 10 TeV, their number density would be about 1000 times lower than that of 10 GeV WIMPs. This low number density may be why physicists have not detected dark matter even though its mass density is 5.4 times greater than that of

ordinary matter [11]. The quarks of these putative dark-matter particles interact via QCD, but their interactions are of very short range because of the high masses of the exchanged glueballs and heavy pions. Strongly interacting dark matter [12] broadens dark-matter cusps into cores [13] as suggested by some observations of galaxies in clusters [14] and of stars in nearby galaxies [15] and so may explain the apparent paucity of heavy dwarf galaxies around our galaxy [16].

The mirror-fermion trick that makes vector-like theories appear chiral at low energies was invented by physicists trying to define chiral gauge theories on the lattice [17]. They doubled the number of fermion fields. A primary set of fermions $\psi = (\psi_\ell; \psi_r)$ transforms under $G \supseteq SU_c(3) \otimes SU(2) \otimes U(1)$, and a secondary set of fermions $\psi' = (\psi'_\ell; \psi'_r)$ transforms under $G' \supseteq SU_c(3) \otimes U(1)$. When certain spinless fields assume suitable mean values in the vacuum, the light fermions are $\psi_m \simeq (\psi_\ell; \psi'_r)$ and have left-handed charged-current weak interactions, while the heavy fermions are $\psi_M \simeq (\psi'_\ell; \psi_r)$ have right-handed charged-current weak interactions. At low energies the theory looks chiral. Many physicists have used this mirror-fermion trick. Anber, Aydemir, Donohue, and Pais [18] used it to make a model in which the fermions have vector-like gauge interactions but chiral Yukawa interactions. Other physicists [19] have used the trick to add vector-like fermions to the standard model in various ways, but few have discussed the spontaneous breaking of parity, perhaps because Vafa and Witten showed [20] that "in parity-conserving vector-like theories such as QCD, parity conservation is not spontaneously broken," a no-go theorem that does not, however, apply to theories with Yukawa interactions [20, 21]. Among the few are Aoki and Gocksch who exhibited the spontaneous breakdown of parity in lattice simulations with Wilson fermions [22].

Section II reviews the way Utiyama and Kibble made theories with fermions generally covariant. In theories that have both scalar and pseudoscalar fields, the mirror-fermion trick works better and can break parity spontaneously as shown in section III. Section IV presents a simple extension of the standard model that one easily can make compatible with general relativity. The model has no problem with flavor-changing neutral currents as long as it respects two $U(1) \otimes U(1)$ symmetries involving the fermions and the spinless bosons. Section V briefly sketches how one might extend this model to one that unifies the strong and electroweak interactions. Some implications of generally covariant extensions of the standard model are mentioned in section VI. The paper ends with a summary in

section VII.

II. SPIN-ONE-HALF FIELDS IN GENERAL RELATIVITY

Decades ago, Utiyama [23] and Kibble [24] showed how to fit spin-one-half fields into general relativity. Suppose the flat-space action density is

$$L = -\overline{\psi}\left[\gamma^a\left(\partial_a + igA_a\right) + m\right]\psi \tag{2}$$

in which a is a flat-space index, A is a matrix of gauge fields, ψ is a four-component Dirac or Majorana field, $\overline{\psi} = \psi^\dagger\beta = i\psi^\dagger\gamma^0$, and m is a constant or a mean value of a scalar field. One first introduces tetrad fields $e_a{}^\mu(x)$ that turn flat-space indices γ^a into curved-space indices $\gamma^a e_a{}^\mu$. Derivatives and gauge fields intrinsically are generally covariant vectors. So the first step is to replace $\gamma^a\left(\partial_a + igA_a\right)$ by $\gamma^a\, e_a{}^\mu\left(\partial_\mu + igA_\mu\right)$. The next step is to correct for the effect of the derivative on the field ψ by making the derivative generally covariant as well as gauge covariant. The required Einstein connection is

$$E_\mu = \frac{1}{2}\sigma^{ab}\, e_a{}^\nu\, e_{b\nu;\mu} \tag{3}$$

in which the σ^{ab} are the 4×4 matrices

$$\sigma^{ab} = \frac{1}{4}\left[\gamma^a, \gamma^b\right], \tag{4}$$

the covariant derivative of the tetrad is

$$e_{b\nu;\mu} = e_{b\nu,\mu} - e_{b\sigma}\,\Gamma^\sigma_{\nu\mu}, \tag{5}$$

commas denote ordinary derivatives, and $\Gamma^\sigma_{\nu\mu} = e^\sigma{}_a e^a{}_{\mu,\nu}$ is the Levi-Civita affine connection. The resulting action density [25]

$$\mathcal{L} = -\overline{\psi}\left[\gamma^a\, e_a{}^\mu\left(\partial_\mu + igA_\mu + E_\mu\right)\right]\psi \tag{6}$$

is invariant $\mathcal{L}(x) \to \mathcal{L}(x')$ under any coordinate transformation $x \to x'$ that is one-to-one and differentiable. In particular, it is invariant under the parity transformation $Px = x' = (x^0, -\boldsymbol{x})$ which takes the field $\psi(x)$ to

$$\mathsf{P}\,\psi(x)\,\mathsf{P}^{-1} = \eta^*\beta\psi(Px) \tag{7}$$

in which η is the intrinsic parity of the particle [26].

One may use this Utiyama-Kibble recipe and the usual covariant derivatives of general relativity to make the action of any of the models of this paper invariant under general coordinate transformations.

III. HOW TO MAKE A VECTOR THEORY LOOK CHIRAL

Most applications of the mirror-fermion trick use two or more scalar fields [17–19] and have Yukawa interactions that explicitly break parity. The models of this paper use scalar fields and pseudoscalar fields and have actions that conserve parity.

In this section and the next one, the scalar field h and a pseudoscalar field p are $SU(2) \otimes U_Y(1)$ doublets

$$h = \begin{pmatrix} h^+ \\ h^0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad p = \begin{pmatrix} p^+ \\ p^0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{8}$$

in which $h^0 = (\bar{h} + h_r + i h_i)/\sqrt{2}$ and $p^0 = (\bar{p} + p_r + i p_i)/\sqrt{2}$. To keep things simple, we first consider an $SU(2) \otimes U_Y(1)$ doublet $q = (u, d)$ of primary quarks of a given color and secondary quarks u' and d' of the same color that transform under $U_Y(1)$ but are singlets under $SU(2)$

$$q = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ d \end{pmatrix}, \quad u', \quad d'. \tag{9}$$

For simplicity, all the spin-one-half fields of this paper are four-component Dirac fields. The Yukawa interactions of q and d'

$$Y_d = c_d \bar{q} \, (h + \gamma^5 p) \, d' + c_d^* \bar{d}' \, (h^\dagger - \gamma^5 p^\dagger) \, q \tag{10}$$

are invariant under space reflection. Here $d^\dagger = (d_\ell^\dagger, d_r^\dagger)$ and $\overline{d} = i d^\dagger \gamma^0 = d^\dagger \beta = (d_r^\dagger, d_\ell^\dagger)$. These Dirac matrices obey $\{\gamma^a, \gamma^b\} = 2\eta^{ab}$ with $\eta^{00} = -1$ and $\gamma_5 = \gamma^5 = (1, 0; 0, -1)$. This form of the Yukawa interaction respects both the $U(1) \otimes U(1)$ symmetry

$$\begin{aligned} q &\to e^{i\theta} \gamma^5 q \quad \text{and} \quad d' \to e^{i(\theta - \chi)} d' \\ h &\to -e^{i\chi} p \quad \text{and} \quad p \to -e^{i\chi} h \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

which leaves $\bar{q} \not{D} q$ and $\bar{d}' d'$ (but not $\bar{q} q$) invariant and the $U(1) \otimes U(1)$ symmetry

$$\begin{aligned} q &\to e^{i\theta} q \quad \text{and} \quad d' \to e^{i(\theta - \chi)} \gamma^5 d' \\ h &\to e^{i\chi} p \quad \text{and} \quad p \to e^{i\chi} h \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

which leaves $\bar{q}I\not{D}q$ and $\bar{q}q$ (but not $\bar{d}'d'$) invariant.

If we replace the fields h and p in the Yukawa interaction (10) by their mean values $(0, h_0)$ and $(0, p_0)$ in the vacuum, where $h_0 = \langle 0|h^0|0\rangle = \bar{h}/\sqrt{2}$ and $p_0 = \langle 0|p^0|0\rangle = \bar{p}/\sqrt{2}$, then the Yukawa interaction (10) yields the mass terms

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{d0} &= c_d \bar{d}\,(h_0 + \gamma^5 p_0)\,d' + c_d^* \bar{d}'\,(h_0^* - \gamma^5 p_0^*)\,d \\ &= c_d\, d_r^\dagger (h_0 + p_0) d'_\ell + c_d\, d_\ell^\dagger (h_0 - p_0) d'_r + c_d^*\, d_r'^\dagger (h_0^* - p_0^*) d_\ell + c_d^* d_\ell'^\dagger (h_0^* + p_0^*) d_r \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} d_\ell^\dagger & d_\ell'^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_d(h_0 - p_0) & 0 \\ 0 & c_d^*(h_0^* + p_0^*) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} d'_r \\ d_r \end{pmatrix} + \text{ h.c.} \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

The main self-interactions of the spinless bosons are

$$V(h,p) = \lambda_h \left(h^\dagger h - \frac{v_{\rm sm}^2}{4} \right)^2 + \lambda_p \left(p^\dagger p - \frac{v_{\rm sm}^2}{4} \right)^2 - \lambda_{hp} \left(h^\dagger p + p^\dagger h \right)^2 \tag{14}$$

where $v_{\rm sm} = 246$ GeV. The third term in V has $0 < \lambda_{hp} \ll 1$ and gives the same phase (taken to be zero) or the opposite phase (In such a universe, the light fermions have right-handed weak interactions.) to the mean values of h^0 and p^0. If $V(h,p)$ were the exact potential of the spinless fields, the mean values of the neutral components of the doublets h and p would satisfy $h_0 = p_0 = v_{\rm sm}/2 = 123$ GeV. I assume that due to otherwise negligible terms in the exact potential, the mean values h_0 and p_0 are only approximately equal, $h_0 \approx p_0$, but that the sum of their squares is $v_{\rm sm}^2/2$

$$|h_0|^2 + |p_0|^2 = \frac{v_{\rm sm}^2}{2} = \frac{(246)^2}{2}\ \text{GeV}^2. \tag{15}$$

The field

$$d_{\rm light} = \begin{pmatrix} d_\ell \\ d'_r \end{pmatrix} \tag{16}$$

then has left-handed $SU(2)$ interactions and a light mass $m_d = |c_d(h_0 - p_0)|$. Similarly, the field

$$d_{\rm heavy} = \begin{pmatrix} d'_\ell \\ d_r \end{pmatrix} \tag{17}$$

has right-handed $SU(2)$ interactions and a larger mass $M_d = |c_d(h_0 + p_0)| = |c_d|\,246$ GeV, which can be as heavy as 1.5 TeV if $|c_d|/4\pi \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Thus a theory whose action conserves parity can look chiral at low energies.

Since the mass $m_{h_r} = \sqrt{2\lambda_h v_{\rm sm}^2}$ of the Higgs boson is 125 GeV, the parameter $\lambda_h = 0.129$. If the diphoton resonance at 750 GeV is real and due to the pseudoscalar p_r, then the parameter λ_p is 4.65.

Before passing to a more complete model, let's note what happens when a scalar field s replaces the pseudoscalar field p. The minus sign in our Yukawa interaction (10) arose because γ^0 and γ^5 anticommute, so the minus sign goes away, and instead of Y_d we have

$$Y_{hs} = \bar{q}\,(c_h h + c_s s)\,d' + \bar{d'}\,(c_h^* h^\dagger + c_s^* s^\dagger)\,q \tag{18}$$

in which c_h and c_s are coupling constants. If the neutral components of the scalar fields h and s assume the mean values h_0 and s_0 in the vacuum, then the mass terms of Y_{hs} are

$$Y_{hs0} = \begin{pmatrix} d_\ell^\dagger & d_\ell'^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_h h_0 + c_s p_0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_h^* h_0^* + c_s^* p_0^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} d_r' \\ d_r \end{pmatrix} + \text{ h.c.} \tag{19}$$

They give the same mass to both (d_ℓ, d_r') and (d_ℓ', d_r). In these models, there is no spontaneous breakdown of parity without pseudoscalar fields.

IV. THE MODEL

In the proposed model and its variants, the vacuum breaks parity by giving a mean value to a new pseudoscalar field p which makes the mirror-fermion trick of section III work. The actions of the models are invariant under general coordinate transformations when suitably decorated with tetrads as in section II. The models have a secondary fermion for each (primary) fermion of the standard model. A gauge group $G \supseteq SU_c(3) \otimes SU_w(2) \otimes U_Y(1)$ acts on the four-component primary fermions, and a group $G' \supseteq SU_c(3) \otimes U_Y(1)$ acts on the secondary fermions.

In the model, the pseudoscalar field p is a doublet that transforms under $SU(2) \otimes U(1)$ like the Higgs doublet. So for $g \in SU(2) \otimes U(1)$ and $g' \in U(1)$, $q \to gq$, $\ell \to g\ell$, $h \to gh$, $p \to gp$, $u' \to g'u'$, $d' \to g'd'$, $\nu' \to g'\nu'$, and $e' \to g'e'$. The covariant derivatives of the primary quark and lepton doublets of the first family are

$$\begin{aligned} D_\mu q &= \left(\partial_\mu + igT_a A_\mu^a + ig'Y B_\mu\right) q = \left(\partial_\mu + ig\frac{\sigma_a}{2} A_\mu^a + ig'\frac{1}{6} B_\mu\right) q \\ D_\mu \ell &= \left(\partial_\mu + igT_a A_\mu^a + ig'Y B_\mu\right) \ell = \left(\partial_\mu + ig\frac{\sigma_a}{2} A_\mu^a - ig'\frac{1}{2} B_\mu\right) \ell, \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

	$q = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ d \end{pmatrix}$	$\ell = \begin{pmatrix} \nu \\ e \end{pmatrix}$	u'	d'	ν'	e'	$h = \begin{pmatrix} h^+ \\ h^0 \end{pmatrix}$	$p = \begin{pmatrix} p^+ \\ p^0 \end{pmatrix}$
isospin t	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2
hypercharge y	$\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$-\frac{1}{3}$	0	-1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
color c	3	1	3	3	1	1	1	1

TABLE I. One family of fermions and the scalar h and pseudoscalar p fields of the simplest model. The integers t and c are the dimension of the representation of $SU_w(2)$ and of $SU_c(3)$.

while those of the secondary quarks u' and d' and leptons ν' and e' are

$$\begin{aligned} D_\mu u' &= \left(\partial_\mu + igT_a A^a_\mu + ig'YB_\mu\right) u' = \left(\partial_\mu + ig'\frac{2}{3}B_\mu\right) u' \\ D_\mu d' &= \left(\partial_\mu + igT_a A^a_\mu + ig'YB_\mu\right) d' = \left(\partial_\mu - ig'\frac{1}{3}B_\mu\right) d' \\ D_\mu \nu' &= \left(\partial_\mu + igT_a A^a_\mu + ig'YB_\mu\right) \nu' = \partial_\mu \nu' \\ D_\mu e' &= \left(\partial_\mu + igT_a A^a_\mu + ig'YB_\mu\right) e' = \left(\partial_\mu - ig'B_\mu\right) e'. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

The first-family Yukawa terms that are allowed by these gauge symmetries and by the two global $U(1) \otimes U(1)$ symmetries

$$\begin{aligned} & q \to e^{i\theta}\gamma^5 q \quad \text{and} \quad \ell \to e^{i\theta}\gamma^5 \ell \\ & u' \to e^{i(\theta+\chi)} u' \quad \text{and} \quad \nu' \to e^{i(\theta+\chi)}\nu' \\ & d' \to -e^{i(\theta-\chi)} d' \quad \text{and} \quad e' \to -e^{i(\theta-\chi)} e' \\ & h \to -e^{i\chi} p \quad \text{and} \quad p \to -e^{i\chi} h \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & q \to e^{i\theta} q \quad \text{and} \quad \ell \to e^{i\theta} \ell \\ & u' \to e^{i(\theta+\chi)}\gamma^5 u' \quad \text{and} \quad \nu' \to e^{i(\theta+\chi)}\gamma^5 \nu' \\ & d' \to e^{i(\theta-\chi)}\gamma^5 d' \quad \text{and} \quad e' \to e^{i(\theta-\chi)}\gamma^5 e' \\ & h \to e^{i\chi} p \quad \text{and} \quad p \to e^{i\chi} h \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

are

$$\begin{aligned} Y = {} & c_u \bar{q}\, i\tau_2 (h^* + \gamma^5 p^*) u' - c_u^* \bar{u}' (h^{\mathsf{T}} - \gamma^5 p^{\mathsf{T}})\, i\tau_2 q \\ & + c_d \bar{q} (h + \gamma^5 p) d' + c_d^* \bar{d}' (h^\dagger - \gamma^5 p^\dagger) q \\ & + c_\nu \bar{\ell}\, i\tau_2 (h^* + \gamma^5 p^*) \nu' - c_\nu^* \bar{\nu}' (h^{\mathsf{T}} - \gamma^5 p^{\mathsf{T}})\, i\tau_2 \ell \\ & + c_e \bar{\ell} (h + \gamma^5 p) e' + c_e^* \bar{e}' (h^\dagger - \gamma^5 p^\dagger) \ell \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

in which τ_2 is the second Pauli matrix. Replacing the bosons by their mean values in the vacuum and grouping fields of the same handedness together, we get

$$\begin{aligned} Y_0 = {} & \begin{pmatrix} u_\ell^\dagger & u_\ell'^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_u(h_0^* - p_0^*) & 0 \\ 0 & c_u^*(h_0 + p_0) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u_r' \\ u_r \end{pmatrix} \\ & + \begin{pmatrix} d_\ell^\dagger & d_\ell'^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_d(h_0 - p_0) & 0 \\ 0 & c_d^*(h_0^* + p_0^*) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} d_r' \\ d_r \end{pmatrix} \\ & + \begin{pmatrix} \nu_\ell^\dagger & \nu_\ell'^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_\nu(h_0^* - p_0^*) & 0 \\ 0 & c_\nu^*(h_0 + p_0) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_r' \\ \nu_r \end{pmatrix} \\ & + \begin{pmatrix} e_\ell^\dagger & e_\ell'^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_e(h_0 - p_0) & 0 \\ 0 & c_e^*(h_0^* + p_0^*) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e_r' \\ e_r \end{pmatrix} + \text{ h.c.} \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

We set

$$|h_0|^2 + |p_0|^2 = \tfrac{1}{2} v_{\text{sm}}^2 = \tfrac{1}{2} (246 \text{ GeV})^2. \tag{26}$$

The light-mass fields of the first family are

$$u_{\text{light}} = \begin{pmatrix} u_\ell \\ u_r' \end{pmatrix}, \quad d_{\text{light}} = \begin{pmatrix} d_\ell \\ d_r' \end{pmatrix}, \quad \nu_{\text{light}} = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_\ell \\ \nu_r' \end{pmatrix}, \quad e_{\text{light}} = \begin{pmatrix} e_\ell \\ e_r' \end{pmatrix}. \tag{27}$$

Their masses are $m_u = |c_u(h_0 - p_0)|$, $m_d = |c_d(h_0 - p_0)|$, $m_{\nu_e} = |c_{\nu_e}(h_0 - p_0)|$, and $m_e = |c_e(h_0 - p_0)|$. The heavy-mass fields are

$$u_{\text{heavy}} = \begin{pmatrix} u_\ell' \\ u_r \end{pmatrix}, \quad d_{\text{heavy}} = \begin{pmatrix} d_\ell' \\ d_r \end{pmatrix}, \quad \nu_{\text{heavy}} = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_\ell' \\ \nu_r \end{pmatrix}, \quad e_{\text{heavy}} = \begin{pmatrix} e_\ell' \\ e_r \end{pmatrix}. \tag{28}$$

Their masses are $M_u = |c_u(h_0 + p_0)|$, $M_d = |c_d(h_0 + p_0)|$, $M_{\nu_e} = |c_{\nu_e}(h_0 + p_0)|$, and $M_e = |c_e(h_0 + p_0)|$.

The potential $V(h, p)$ of the self-interactions (14) of the spin-zero fields and otherwise negligible terms give $h_0 \approx p_0$ and $|h_0|^2 + |p_0|^2 = v_{\text{sm}}^2/2 = \frac{1}{2}(246 \text{ GeV})^2$. So the light masses can be very light, and the heavy ones can be as high as 1.5 TeV when the $|c|$'s are $\sim 2\pi$.

To see if we can keep the W and Z gauge bosons and the photon at their physical masses, we note that the covariant derivative acting on h and on p, which have $y = \frac{1}{2}$, is

$$D_\mu = \partial_\mu + igT_a A^a_\mu + ig' Y B_\mu = \partial_\mu + ig\frac{\sigma_a}{2} A^a_\mu + ig'\frac{1}{2} B_\mu. \tag{29}$$

The mean value in the vacuum of $D_\mu h$ is

$$\langle D_\mu h \rangle_0 = \left(ig\frac{\sigma_a}{2} A^a_\mu + ig'\frac{1}{2} B_\mu \right) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ h_0 \end{pmatrix} = i\frac{h_0}{2} \begin{pmatrix} g(A^1_\mu - iA^2_\mu) \\ -gA^3_\mu + g' B_\mu \end{pmatrix}, \tag{30}$$

and that of $D_\mu p$ is

$$\langle D_\mu p \rangle_0 = \left(ig\frac{\sigma_a}{2} A^a_\mu + ig'\frac{1}{2} B_\mu \right) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ p_0 \end{pmatrix} = i\frac{p_0}{2} \begin{pmatrix} g(A^1_\mu - iA^2_\mu) \\ -gA^3_\mu + g' B_\mu \end{pmatrix}. \tag{31}$$

The resulting mass terms of the gauge bosons are

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\, (D_\mu h)^\dagger D^\mu h \,\rangle_0 + \langle\, (D_\mu p)^\dagger D^\mu p \,\rangle_0 = \frac{|h_0|^2 + |p_0|^2}{4} \Big[& g^2 \left(A^1_\mu A^{1\mu} + A^2_\mu A^{2_\mu} \right) \\ & + \left(-gA^3_\mu + g' B_\mu \right) \left(-gA^{3\mu} + g' B^\mu \right) \Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

The photon $g' A^3_\mu + g B_\mu$ remains massless, and the $W^\pm$ and Z

$$W^\pm_\mu = \frac{A^1_\mu \mp iA^2_\mu}{\sqrt{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad Z_\mu = \frac{gA^3_\mu - g' B_\mu}{\sqrt{g^2 + g'^2}} \tag{33}$$

get their physical masses

$$m_W = \frac{g\, v_{\rm sm}}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad m_Z = \frac{\sqrt{g^2 + g'^2}\, v_{\rm sm}}{2}. \tag{34}$$

Models with two Higgs doublets are notorious for having flavor-changing neutral currents [27]. But our Yukawa interactions (24) extended to three families

$$\begin{aligned} Y = & \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \Big[c_{u,i,j} \bar{q}_i\, i\tau_2 (h^* + \gamma^5 p^*) u'_j + c_{d,i,j} \bar{q}_i (h + \gamma^5 p) d'_j \\ & + c_{\nu,i,j} \bar{\ell}_i\, i\tau_2 (h^* + \gamma^5 p^*) \nu'_j + c_{e,i,j} \bar{\ell}_i (h + \gamma^5 p) e' + \text{h.c.} \Big] \\ = & \sum_{\alpha=q}^{\ell} \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \left[c_{\alpha,\frac{1}{2},i,j}\, \bar{\alpha}_i\, i\tau_2 \left(h^* + \gamma^5 p^* \right) \alpha'_{\frac{1}{2},j} + c_{\alpha,-\frac{1}{2},i,j}\, \bar{\alpha}_i \left(h + \gamma^5 p \right) \alpha'_{-\frac{1}{2},j} + \text{h.c.} \right] \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

respect the two $U(1) \otimes U(1)$ symmetries (22 & 23). Their mass terms (25) are a sum over $\alpha = q$ and ℓ, over $t_3 = \pm\frac{1}{2}$, and over the family indices $i, j = 1, 2, 3$

$$\begin{aligned} Y_0 = & \sum_{\alpha=q}^{\ell} \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha^\dagger_{\ell,\frac{1}{2},i} & \alpha'^\dagger_{\ell,\frac{1}{2},i} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_{\alpha,\frac{1}{2},i,j}(h_0^* - p_0^*) & 0 \\ 0 & c^*_{\alpha,\frac{1}{2},i,j}(h_0 + p_0) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha'_{r,\frac{1}{2},j} \\ \alpha_{r,\frac{1}{2},j} \end{pmatrix} \\ & + \sum_{\alpha=q}^{\ell} \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha^\dagger_{\ell,-\frac{1}{2},i} & \alpha'^\dagger_{\ell,-\frac{1}{2},i} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_{\alpha,-\frac{1}{2},i,j}(h_0 - p_0) & 0 \\ 0 & c^*_{\alpha,-\frac{1}{2},i,j}(h_0^* + p_0^*) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha'_{r,-\frac{1}{2},j} \\ \alpha_{r,-\frac{1}{2},j} \end{pmatrix} + \text{ h.c.} \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

For instance, the mass terms of the light $t_3 = \frac{1}{2}$ quarks u, c, t are

$$L_{YLq,\frac{1}{2}} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} c_{q,\frac{1}{2},i,j}(h_0^* - p_0^*)\, q^\dagger_{\ell,\frac{1}{2},i} q'_{r,\frac{1}{2},j} + \text{ h.c.} \tag{37}$$

Their mass matrix is

$$\left[M_{Lq,\frac{1}{2}}\right]_{i,j} = c_{q,\frac{1}{2},i,j}\,(h_0^* - p_0^*) = (h_0^* - p_0^*)\,\left[C_{q,\frac{1}{2}}\right]_{ij}. \tag{38}$$

It has the singular-value decomposition [28]

$$M_{Lq,\frac{1}{2}} = (h_0^* - p_0^*)\, C_{q,\frac{1}{2}} = (h_0^* - p_0^*)\, L_{q,\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma_{q,\frac{1}{2}} R^\dagger_{q,\frac{1}{2}} \tag{39}$$

in which $L_{q,\frac{1}{2}}$ and $R_{q,\frac{1}{2}}$ are 3×3 unitary matrices, and $\Sigma_{q,\frac{1}{2}}$ is a 3×3 diagonal matrix with positive singular values—the masses of the light u, c, t quarks divided by $|h_0 - p_0|$—on its main diagonal. The left and right mass eigenfields of the light $t_3 = \frac{1}{2}$ quarks, shown in a lower-case (for light) bold (for mass) font, are

$$\boldsymbol{q}_{\ell,\frac{1}{2},i} = \left[L^\dagger_{q,\frac{1}{2}}\right]_{ij} q_{\ell,\frac{1}{2},j} \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{q}_{r,\frac{1}{2},i} = \left[R^\dagger_{q,\frac{1}{2}}\right]_{ij} q'_{r,\frac{1}{2},j}. \tag{40}$$

The masses of u, c, and t are

$$m_{q,\frac{1}{2},i} = |h_0 - p_0|\,\left[\Sigma_{q,\frac{1}{2}}\right]_i. \tag{41}$$

Similarly, the mass terms of the light $t_3 = -\frac{1}{2}$ quarks d, s, b are

$$Y_{Lq,-\frac{1}{2}} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} c_{q,-\frac{1}{2},i,j}(h_0 - p_0)\, q^\dagger_{\ell,-\frac{1}{2},i} q'_{r,-\frac{1}{2},j} + \text{ h.c.} \tag{42}$$

Their mass matrix is

$$\left[M_{Lq,-\frac{1}{2}}\right]_{i,j} = c_{q,-\frac{1}{2},i,j}\,(h_0 - p_0) = (h_0 - p_0)\,\left[C_{q,-\frac{1}{2}}\right]_{ij}. \tag{43}$$

It has the singular-value decomposition [28]

$$M_{Lq,-\frac{1}{2}} = (h_0 - p_0)\, C_{q,-\frac{1}{2}} = (h_0 - p_0)\, L_{q,-\frac{1}{2}}\, \Sigma_{q,-\frac{1}{2}}\, R^\dagger_{q,-\frac{1}{2}} \tag{44}$$

in which $L_{q,-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $R_{q,-\frac{1}{2}}$ are 3×3 unitary matrices, and $\Sigma_{q,-\frac{1}{2}}$ is a 3×3 diagonal matrix with positive singular values—the masses of the light d, s, b quarks divided by $|h_0 - p_0|$—on its main diagonal. The left and right mass eigenfields of the light $t_3 = -\frac{1}{2}$ quarks (again in a lower-case, bold font) are

$$\boldsymbol{q}_{\ell,-\frac{1}{2},i} = \left[L^\dagger_{q,-\frac{1}{2}}\right]_{ij} q_{\ell,-\frac{1}{2},j} \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{q}_{r,-\frac{1}{2},i} = \left[R^\dagger_{q,-\frac{1}{2}}\right]_{ij} q'_{r,-\frac{1}{2},j}. \tag{45}$$

Their masses for $i = d, s, b$ are

$$m_{q,-\frac{1}{2},i} = |h_0 - p_0| \ \left[\Sigma_{q,-\frac{1}{2}}\right]_i. \tag{46}$$

The CKM matrix for the light quarks is

$$V_{Lq} = L^\dagger_{q,\frac{1}{2}}\, L_{q,-\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{47}$$

The simplicity and symmetries (22 & 23) of the present model ensure that there are no flavor-changing neutral currents.

The mass terms of the heavy $t_3 = \frac{1}{2}$ quarks U, C, T are

$$Y_{Hq,\frac{1}{2}} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} c^*_{q,\frac{1}{2},i,j} (h_0 + p_0)\, q'^\dagger_{\ell,\frac{1}{2},i}\, q_{r,\frac{1}{2},j} + \text{ h.c.} \tag{48}$$

Their mass matrix

$$\left[M_{Hq,\frac{1}{2}}\right]_{i,j} = c^*_{q,\frac{1}{2},i,j}\, (h_0 + p_0) = (h_0 + p_0)\ \left[C^*_{q,\frac{1}{2}}\right]_{ij} \tag{49}$$

is proportional to the complex conjugate of the mass matrix $M_{Lq,\frac{1}{2}}$ of the light $t_3 = \frac{1}{2}$ quarks u, c, t

$$\left[M_{Hq,\frac{1}{2}}\right]_{i,j} = \frac{h_0 + p_0}{h_0 - p_0}\ \left[M^*_{Lq,\frac{1}{2}}\right]_{ij}. \tag{50}$$

It has a singular-value decomposition [28]

$$M_{Hq,\frac{1}{2}} = (h_0 + p_0)\, C^*_{q,\frac{1}{2}} = (h_0 + p_0)\, L^*_{q,\frac{1}{2}}\, \Sigma_{q,\frac{1}{2}}\ \left[R^*_{q,\frac{1}{2}}\right]^\dagger \tag{51}$$

that is the complex conjugate of that (44) of the light $t_3 = \frac{1}{2}$ quarks apart from an overall factor. The left and right mass eigenfields of the heavy $t_3 = \frac{1}{2}$ quarks are

$$\boldsymbol{Q}_{\ell,\frac{1}{2},i} = \left[L^\dagger_{q,\frac{1}{2}}\right]^*_{ij} q'_{\ell,\frac{1}{2},j} \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{Q}_{r,\frac{1}{2},i} = \left[R^\dagger_{q,\frac{1}{2}}\right]^*_{ij} q_{r,\frac{1}{2},j}. \tag{52}$$

The masses of the $i = U, C, T$ are proportional to those of u, c, t

$$M_{q,\frac{1}{2},i} = \frac{|h_0 + p_0|}{|h_0 - p_0|}\, m_{q,\frac{1}{2},i}. \tag{53}$$

The LHC may verify or falsify this prediction.

Similarly, the mass terms of the heavy $t_3 = -\frac{1}{2}$ quarks D, S, B are

$$Y_{Hq,-\frac{1}{2}} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} c^*_{q,-\frac{1}{2},i,j}(h^*_0 + p^*_0)\, q'^{\dagger}_{\ell,-\frac{1}{2},i} q_{r,-\frac{1}{2},j} + \text{ h.c.} \tag{54}$$

Their mass matrix is

$$\left[M_{Hq,-\frac{1}{2}}\right]_{i,j} = c^*_{q,-\frac{1}{2},i,j}\,(h^*_0 + p^*_0) = (h^*_0 + p^*_0)\, \left[C^*_{q,-\frac{1}{2}}\right]_{ij}. \tag{55}$$

Its singular-value decomposition [28] is the complex conjugate of the one for the light $t_3 = -\frac{1}{2}$ quarks apart from an overall factor

$$M_{Hq,-\frac{1}{2}} = (h^*_0 + p^*_0)\, C^*_{q,-\frac{1}{2}} = (h^*_0 + p^*_0)\, L^*_{q,-\frac{1}{2}}\, \Sigma_{q,-\frac{1}{2}}\, \left[R^*_{q,-\frac{1}{2}}\right]^{\dagger}. \tag{56}$$

The left and right mass eigenfields of the light $t_3 = -\frac{1}{2}$ quarks (in an upper-case, bold font) are

$$\boldsymbol{Q}_{\ell,-\frac{1}{2},i} = \left[L^{\dagger}_{q,-\frac{1}{2}}\right]^*_{ij} q'_{\ell,-\frac{1}{2},j} \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{Q}_{r,-\frac{1}{2},i} = \left[R^{\dagger}_{q,-\frac{1}{2}}\right]^*_{ij} q_{r,-\frac{1}{2},j}. \tag{57}$$

The masses of the $i = D, S, B$ are proportional to those of d, s, b

$$M_{q,-\frac{1}{2},i} = \frac{|h_0 + p_0|}{|h_0 - p_0|}\, m_{q,-\frac{1}{2},i}, \tag{58}$$

and the factor of proportionality is the same as for the $t_3 = \frac{1}{2}$ quarks (53).

The CKM matrix for the heavy quarks is the complex conjugate of the one V_L for the light quarks

$$V_{Hq} = \left[L^{\dagger}_{q,\frac{1}{2}}\right]^* \left[L_{q,-\frac{1}{2}}\right]^* = V^*_L. \tag{59}$$

There are no flavor-changing neutral currents in this model.

The neutral and charged leptons obey the same relations as do the quarks. The matrices C_{ℓ,t_3} of coefficients $C_{\ell,t_3} = c_{\ell,t_3,i,j}$ have singular-value decompositions

$$C_{\ell,t_3} = L_{\ell,t_3}\, \Sigma_{\ell,t_3}\, R^{\dagger}_{\ell,t_3}. \tag{60}$$

The left and right mass eigenfields of the light leptons are

$$\boldsymbol{\ell}_{\ell,t_3,i} = \left[L^{\dagger}_{\ell,t_3}\right]_{ij} \ell_{\ell,t_3,j} \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\ell}_{r,t_3,i} = \left[R^{\dagger}_{\ell,t_3}\right]_{ij} \ell'_{r,t_3,j}. \tag{61}$$

The left and right mass eigenfields of the heavy leptons are

$$\boldsymbol{L}_{\ell,t_3,i} = \left[L^\dagger_{\ell,t_3}\right]^*_{ij} \, \ell'_{\ell,t_3,j} \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{L}_{r,t_3,i} = \left[R^\dagger_{\ell,t_3}\right]^*_{ij} \, \ell_{r,t_3,j}. \tag{62}$$

Their CKM matrices are

$$V_{L\ell} = L^\dagger_{\ell,\frac{1}{2}} \, L_{\ell,-\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad V_{H\ell} = \left[L^\dagger_{\ell,\frac{1}{2}}\right]^* \left[L_{\ell,-\frac{1}{2}}\right]^* = V^*_{L\ell}. \tag{63}$$

Every light lepton $(\ell_{\ell,t_3,i}, \ell'_{r,t_3,i})$ with mass $m_{\ell,t_3,i}$ has a heavy partner $(\ell'_{\ell,t_3,i}, \ell_{r,t_3,i})$ of mass

$$M_{\ell,t_3,i} = \frac{|h_0 + p_0|}{|h_0 - p_0|} \, m_{\ell,t_3,i} \tag{64}$$

a striking prediction that is eminently falsifiable.

If the model is correct, the pseudoscalar boson p may be the 750 GeV resonance seen in the two-gamma channel by ATLAS and CMS.

The model and its variants conserve fermion number f understood as the sum of the number of (primary and secondary or light and heavy) quarks plus the number of (primary and secondary or light and heavy) leptons

$$f = q + \ell. \tag{65}$$

When applied to all three families with one Higgs doublet h and one pseudoscalar doublet p, the model does have at least one possible problem: the masses of the light quarks and leptons and of the W and Z gauge bosons and the lower limits on heavy quarks and leptons require some of the Yukawa coefficients to exceed 4π by significant margins. The mass relations (53, 58, & 64) imply the trace relations for $\alpha = q, \ell$ and for $t_3 = \pm\frac{1}{2}$

$$\text{Tr}\left(C^\dagger_{\alpha,t_3} \, C_{\alpha,t_3}\right) = \text{Tr}\left(\Sigma^2_{\alpha,t_3}\right) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^3 m^2_{\alpha,t_3,i}}{|h_0 - p_0|^2} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^3 M^2_{\alpha,t_3,i}}{|h_0 + p_0|^2}. \tag{66}$$

We first maximize $|h_0 + p_0|$ subject to the constraint (26) that $|h_0|^2 + |p_0|^2 = \frac{1}{2}v^2_{\text{sm}}$. The exact maximum is when $h_0 = p_0 = \frac{1}{2}e^{i\phi}v_{\text{sm}}$. I assume that otherwise negligible terms in the potential of the spinless fields perturb this equality so that we have $h_0 \approx p_0$, and $|h_0 + p_0| = v_{\text{sm}} = 246$ GeV. With these assumptions, our four trace relations (66) become

$$\text{Tr}\left(C^\dagger_{\alpha,t_3} \, C_{\alpha,t_3}\right) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^3 m^2_{\alpha,t_3,i}}{|h_0 - p_0|^2} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^3 M^2_{\alpha,t_3,i}}{v^2_{\text{sm}}}. \tag{67}$$

Under various assumtions [5, 6], the lower limits on heavy quarks are 735 GeV for $t_3 = \frac{1}{2}$ and 755 GeV for $t_3 = -\frac{1}{2}$, and the lower limit on heavy charged leptons is 102 GeV. The

sums of the squares of the masses of the light quarks and charged leptons in GeV^2 are $m^2_{q,\frac{1}{2},i} = 30,003$, $m^2_{q,-\frac{1}{2},i} = 17.48$, and $m^2_{\ell,\frac{1}{2},i} = 3.168$. The three trace relations (67) now say that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Tr}\left(C^\dagger_{q,\frac{1}{2}}\, C_{q,\frac{1}{2}}\right) &= \frac{30003}{|h_0 - p_0|^2} \geq \frac{3 \times 735^2}{246^2} = 26.8 \\
\mathrm{Tr}\left(C^\dagger_{q,-\frac{1}{2}}\, C_{q,-\frac{1}{2}}\right) &= \frac{17.48}{|h_0 - p_0|^2} \geq \frac{3 \times 755^2}{246^2} = 28.3 \\
\mathrm{Tr}\left(C^\dagger_{\ell,-\frac{1}{2}}\, C_{\ell,-\frac{1}{2}}\right) &= \frac{3.168}{|h_0 - p_0|^2} \geq \frac{3 \times 102^2}{246^2} = 0.516.
\end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

The middle equation gives the most stringent of the bounds on the squared difference

$$(h_0 - p_0)^2 \leq 17.48/28.3 = 0.618 \ \ \mathrm{GeV}^2. \tag{69}$$

But then the three equations imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{\langle |c_{q,\frac{1}{2}}|^2 \rangle} &\geq \frac{\sqrt{30003}}{\sqrt{9 \times 0.618}} = 73.45 \\
\sqrt{\langle |c_{q,-\frac{1}{2}}|^2 \rangle} &\geq \frac{\sqrt{17.48}}{\sqrt{9 \times 0.618}} = 1.773 \\
\sqrt{\langle |c_{\ell,-\frac{1}{2}}|^2 \rangle} &\geq \frac{\sqrt{3.168}}{\sqrt{9 \times 0.618}} = 0.7547.
\end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

The root-mean-squared value of the coefficients $c_{q,\frac{1}{2},i,j}$ divided by 4π is 5.84, and so this model has nonperturbative couplings.

No physical law says that all the couplings of a theory must be small enough for perturbation theory to be valid. Where running coupling constants are big, one can use lattice methods. But big Yukawa couplings of the Higgs field to the fermions may imply branching ratios of Higgs to gluon plus gluon, $h \to g + g$, and of Higgs to photon plus photon, $h \to \gamma + \gamma$, that exceed bounds measured at the LHC.

The need for large Yukawa coupling constants may be a sign of new physics at a higher energy scale Λ. The huge range of light fermion masses may mean that there are several Higgs fields [29]. There might be new scalar fields $\phi_{\alpha,t_3,i,j}$ for fermion kind $\alpha = q, \ell$, isospin $t_3 = \pm\frac{1}{2}$, and family number $i, j = 1, 2, 3$ some of which have mean values $\phi_{\alpha,t_3,i,j,0}$ in the vacuum that greatly exceed the higher energy Λ. Each awkwardly large coupling constant $c_{\alpha,t_3,i,j}$ then could be the product of a suitably small dimensionless coupling constant $g_{\alpha,t_3,i,k}$ multiplied by the ratio of the mean value $\phi_{\alpha,t_3,k,j,0}$ in the vacuum of a new spinless field

$\phi_{\alpha,t_3,k,j}$ to the scale Λ of the new physics possibly summed over k

$$c_{\alpha,t_3,i,j} = \sum_{k=1}^{3} g_{\alpha,t_3,i,k} \, \frac{\langle 0|\phi_{\alpha,t_3,k,j}|0\rangle}{\Lambda}. \tag{71}$$

The Yukawa interactions (35) then would be the dimension-5 operators

$$\begin{aligned} Y_\Lambda = \sum_{\alpha=q}^{\ell} \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \Big[& g_{\alpha,\frac{1}{2},i,k} \, \bar{\alpha}_i \, i\tau_2 \, (h^* + \gamma^5 p^*) \, \frac{\phi_{\alpha,\frac{1}{2},k,j}}{\Lambda} \, \alpha'_{\frac{1}{2},j} \\ & + g_{\alpha,-\frac{1}{2},i,k} \, \bar{\alpha}_i \, (h + \gamma^5 p) \, \frac{\phi_{\alpha,-\frac{1}{2},k,j}}{\Lambda} \, \alpha'_{-\frac{1}{2},j} \Big] + \text{ h.c.} \end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

The resulting mass terms would be those of our earlier formula (36) but with the coupling constants $c_{\alpha,t_3,i,j}$ replaced by the ratios (71) in which the coupling constants $g_{\alpha,t_3,k,j}$ of its ultraviolet completion are small and dimensionless. We then would regard the model as an effective field theory.

As in supersymmetric theories, it is natural to replace $i\tau_2 h^*$ and $i\tau_2 p^*$ in the action density by new fields h_2 and p_2 that transform the same way. One might even add more scalar and pseudoscalar fields h_i and p_i as in private-Higgs models [29].

There are many ways to tweak and extend this model both at ordinary energies and at higher energies; I leave these elaborations to future work.

V. POSSIBLE GRAND UNIFICATIONS

The masses of the light fermions span a huge range, but all three families are nearly massless on a scale of 10 TeV. A symmetry may be lurking here [30], but instead of trying to find it, I will discuss briefly in this section the form grand unification may take when the action conserves parity. The main change is that gauge fields act on four-component Dirac fermions rather than on two-component, left-handed fermions. Thus antifermions and fermions don't occur in the same multiplet, and fermion number $f = q + \ell$, which is quark number plus lepton number, is conserved. The decay of a baryon proceeds through the exchange of three gauge bosons, bringing down the energy scale of nucleon decay.

In this section, I will sketch how one might extend the simple model of the previous section for the case of the first family. For simplicity, I will assume that a single gauge group that combines the strong and electroweak interactions acts on each of the three families. There are 8 first-family primary fermions and 8 first-family secondary fermions for a total of

16. We can group the primary and secondary fermions of the first family into four quartets U, D, U', D' and combine them into a 16-component F

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} u \\ u \\ u \\ \nu \end{bmatrix}, \quad D = \begin{bmatrix} d \\ d \\ d \\ e \end{bmatrix}, \quad U' = \begin{bmatrix} u' \\ u' \\ u' \\ \nu' \end{bmatrix}, \quad D' = \begin{bmatrix} d' \\ d' \\ d' \\ e' \end{bmatrix}, \quad F = \begin{bmatrix} U \\ D \\ U' \\ D' \end{bmatrix}. \tag{73}$$

Its covariant derivative involves a 16×16 matrix of gauge fields A

$$A\,F = \begin{bmatrix} G + A^3 + B & A^1 - iA^2 & E_{11} & E_{12} \\ A^1 + iA^2 & G - A^3 + B & E_{21} & E_{22} \\ E_{11}^\dagger & E_{21}^\dagger & G + C^3 + B & C^1 - iC^2 \\ E_{12}^\dagger & E_{22}^\dagger & C^1 + iC^2 & G - C^3 + B \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} U \\ D \\ U' \\ D' \end{bmatrix} \tag{74}$$

in which the gluons and electroweak gauge bosons of the simple model of section IV are $G \equiv \frac{1}{2} g_s \gamma^\mu G^b_\mu \lambda_b$, $A^i \equiv \frac{1}{2} g \gamma^\mu A^i_\mu I$, and $B \equiv \frac{1}{2} g' \gamma^\mu B_\mu Y$, and I is the 4×4 identity matrix. The gauge group determines what other gauge bosons are present in the matrix A; to simplify the notation, I have left many blank. Some possible new heavy gauge bosons are $C^i \equiv g'' \gamma^\mu C^i_\mu I$ and the 4×4 blocks E_{ij}.

In more detail, the upper-left 4×4 submatrix is

$$G + A^3 + B = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} g_s G^b_\mu \lambda_b + \frac{1}{2} g A^3_\mu I_3 + \frac{1}{2} g' B_\mu y_u I_3 & \vec{J} \\ \vec{\bar{J}} & \frac{1}{2} g A^3_\mu + \frac{1}{2} g' B_\mu y_\nu \end{pmatrix} \tag{75}$$

in which I_3 is the 3×3 identity matrix, and the very heavy gauge bosons $\vec{J} = (J, J, J)$ mediate $u \to \nu + J^{2/3}$. The positions in $A^1 - iA^2$ corresponding to those of $\vec{J}$ are filled by the very heavy gauge bosons $\vec{K} = (K, K, K)$ which mediate $d \to \nu + K^{-1/3}$.

One can use the trick of sections III & IV to give masses to the fermions. If we generalize that model by replacing the fields $i\tau_2 h^*$ and $i\tau_2 p^*$ with new fields h_u and p_u (with $y = -\frac{1}{2}$) and by allowing separate Higgs fields for the leptons, then the Yukawa interactions (35) become

$$L_Y = \begin{pmatrix} \overline{U} & \overline{D} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} H_{UU'} + \gamma^5 P_{UU'} & 0 \\ 0 & H_{DD'} + \gamma^5 P_{DD'} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} U' \\ D' \end{pmatrix} + \text{ h.c.} \tag{76}$$

in which the 4×4 matrices $H_{UU'} \ldots P_{DD'}$ are the block-diagonal forms

$$\begin{aligned} H_{UU'} &= c_{\frac{1}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} h_u I_3 & 0 \\ 0 & h_\nu \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad H_{DD'} = c_{-\frac{1}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} h_d I_3 & 0 \\ 0 & h_e \end{pmatrix} \\ P_{UU'} &= c_{\frac{1}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} p_u I_3 & 0 \\ 0 & p_\nu \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad P_{DD'} = c_{-\frac{1}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} p_d I_3 & 0 \\ 0 & p_e \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

and I_3 is a 3×3 identity matrix which avoids breaking color symmetry.

As the form, but not the content, of the matrices (76) suggests, the spinless fields of a Yukawa interaction naturally transform in an adjoint representation. If they do, then they might form 8×8 matrices H_8 and P_8 and appear in Yukawa interactions as

$$L_Y = \begin{pmatrix} \overline{U} & \overline{D} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} H_{UU'} + \gamma^5 P_{UU'} & H_{UD'} + \gamma^5 P_{UD'} \\ H_{DU'} + \gamma^5 P_{DU'} & H_{DD'} + \gamma^5 P_{DD'} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} U' \\ D' \end{pmatrix} + \text{ h.c.} \tag{78}$$

As a further step toward the grand unification of the Higgs sector, one could form 16×16 hermitian matrices H_{16} and P_{16} of scalar and pseudoscalar fields that transform in the adjoint representation of the gauge group, conceivably $SU(16)$. When H_{16} and P_{16} assume mean values in the vacuum, their Yukawa interactions $\overline{F}\,(H_{16} + \gamma^5 P_{16})\,F$ would produce mass terms analogous to those (25) of the model of section IV

$$L_{Y0} = \begin{bmatrix} U^* \\ D^* \\ U'^* \\ D'^* \end{bmatrix}_\ell^{\mathsf{T}} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & H_{UU'0} - P_{UU'0} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & H_{DD'0} - P_{DD'0} \\ H^*_{UU'0} + P^*_{UU'0} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & H^*_{DD'0} + P^*_{DD'0} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} U \\ D \\ U' \\ D' \end{bmatrix}_r + \text{h.c.} \tag{79}$$

The 4×4 matrices $H_{UU'0} \ldots P_{DD'0}$ are the matrices (77) with $h_u \ldots p_e$ replaced by their mean values $h_{u0} \ldots p_{e0}$. These diagonal mean values split the masses of the light-quark and light-lepton mass eigenfields

$$\begin{aligned} m_u &= |c_{\frac{1}{2}}\,(h_{u0} - p_{u0})\,| \quad \text{and} \quad m_\nu = |c_{\frac{1}{2}}\,(h_{\nu 0} - p_{\nu 0})\,| \\ m_d &= |c_{-\frac{1}{2}}\,(h_{d0} - p_{d0})\,| \quad \text{and} \quad m_e = |c_{-\frac{1}{2}}\,(h_{e0} - p_{e0})\,| \end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

from those of the heavy-quark and heavy-lepton mass eigenfields

$$\begin{aligned} M_U &= |c_{\frac{1}{2}}\,(h_{u0} + p_{u0})\,| \quad \text{and} \quad M_N = |c_{\frac{1}{2}}\,(h_{\nu 0} + p_{\nu 0})\,| \\ M_D &= |c_{-\frac{1}{2}}\,(h_{d0} + p_{d0})\,| \quad \text{and} \quad M_E = |c_{-\frac{1}{2}}\,(h_{e0} + p_{e0})\,|. \end{aligned} \tag{81}$$

All the mean values $h_{u0} \dots p_{e0}$ are colorless and neutral. To make the masses $M_U \dots M_N$ of the mirror fermions much greater than those of the usual fermions, we need $p_{u0} \approx h_{u0}$, $p_{d0} \approx h_{d0}$, $p_{\nu 0} \approx h_{\nu 0}$, and $p_{e0} \approx h_{e0}$ with suitable $|h_0|$'s and coupling constants. A more realistic treatment would couple three families of fermions with coupling constants c_{t_3yij}.

We can get some idea of how some of the gauge fields get their masses by writing them in 8×8 blocks as

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{A} & \mathcal{B} \\ \mathcal{B}^\dagger & \mathcal{D} \end{pmatrix} \tag{82}$$

and by roughly approximating the mean values in the vacuum of the spinless fields as

$$H_0 \equiv H_{16,0} \approx h_0 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ I & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad P_0 \equiv P_{16,0} \approx p_0 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -I \\ I & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{83}$$

in which $p_0 \approx h_0$. The mean value in the vacuum of the covariant derivative of the scalar field H then would contain the commutator

$$[A, H_0] \approx h_0 \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{B} - \mathcal{B}^\dagger & \mathcal{A} - \mathcal{D} \\ \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{A} & \mathcal{B}^\dagger - \mathcal{B} \end{pmatrix} \tag{84}$$

while that of the pseudoscalar field P would contain the commutator

$$[A, P_0] \approx p_0 \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{B}^\dagger & \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{A} \\ \mathcal{D} - \mathcal{A} & -\mathcal{B} - \mathcal{B}^\dagger \end{pmatrix}. \tag{85}$$

Thus the traces $\text{Tr}\left([A, H_0]^\dagger [A, H_0]\right)$ and $\text{Tr}\left([A, P_0]^\dagger [A, P_0]\right)$ would make the 128 gauge fields $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{B}^\dagger$ and the 64 gauge fields $\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{D}$ heavy but would leave the 63 gauge fields $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{D}$ light or massless. It is interesting that the Higgs field H_{16} and the pseudoscalar field P_{16}, which spontaneously breaks parity, give heavy masses to most of the gauge fields E_{ij} that must be massive for the model to have a chance at realism. The gluons, denoted G in the matrix (74) of gauge fields, occur in both $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ and so remain massless, which is reassuring. I do not, however, see a nice way to make the other gauge bosons C, $J^{2/3}$, $K^{-1/3}$, and so forth suitably heavy. One possibility is to adjust the masses of the gauge fields by having them also act on complex 16-vectors of spinless scalar Φ and pseudoscalar Φ' bosons which assume suitable mean values in the vacuum.

What should the gauge group G of grand unification be? Along with the standard-model groups $SU_c(3)$, $SU_w(2)$, and $U_Y(1)$, this group also should include something else, such as a

second $SU_w(2)'$, written as C in (74), acting on the mirror fermions but not on the primary fermions. So the group must have rank 5 or higher. The possible groups are $SU(n)$ for $n \geq 6$, $SO(2n)$ or $SO(2n+1)$ for $n \geq 5$, $Sp(2n)$ for $n \geq 5$, and E_n for $n \geq 6$. The group should have an irreducible representation that has room for the eight fermions $\vec{u}$, $\vec{d}$, ν, and e of a family and also for the eight mirror fermions, $\vec{u}'$, $\vec{d}'$, ν', and e'. That is, the group should have a **16**. The group $SU(6)$ has the irreducible representations **6**, **15**, **20**, **35**, and **70**; the group $SU(7)$ has a **7**, a **21**, a **35**, and a **112**; none of these is a **16**. The group $SU(8)$ has an **8**, a **28**, a **56**, and a **63**. The reducible representation $\mathbf{8} \oplus \mathbf{8}$ might work. The group $SU(16)$ has a **16** as its defining representation and a **255** as its adjoint representation. The group $SO(10)$ also has a **16**, but that representation has two **3**'s and two $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$'s, not the four **3**'s that we need. The **16** of $SO(11)$ also has $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$'s. The group $Sp(2n)$ contains the $\bar{\mathbf{n}}$ as well as the **n** of $SU(n)$, which again is not what is needed. The group E_6 has two **27**'s, a **78**, and a **351**. The group E_7 has a **56** and a **133**, while E_8 has a **248** and a **3875**. We are left with either the $\mathbf{8} \oplus \mathbf{8}$ of $SU(8)$ or the **16** of $SU(16)$.

The size of these gauge groups may be warning us not to attempt grand unification at this stage of our understanding of particle physics. Inasmuch as the known fermions are massless on a scale of several TeV (let alone one PeV), it may make sense to try to understand why there are three light families before trying to unify the strong and electroweak interactions [30].

VI. SOME IMPLICATIONS

The model of section IV may be the simplest extension of the standard model in which the vacuum spontaneously breaks parity. The model's pseudoscalar field could have a mass of 750 GeV and decay into two photons.

As sketched in section V, one can envision extending the model as grand unification has extended the standard model, but with an interesting difference. For whereas traditional grand unification represents all the fermion fields as left handed, no such restriction applies to the grandly unified extensions of the model of this paper. The grandly unified models of section V do not put fermions and antifermions in the same multiplets. They conserve fermion number $f = q + \ell$, which is quite different from baryon number minus lepton number.

In many such extensions of the model, the proton is unstable to decays like $p \to \pi^+ + 3\nu$

and $p \to e^+ + 4\nu$ since the proton and the combinations $\pi^+ + 3\nu$ and $e^+ + 4\nu$ all have $f = 3$ and electric charge $+1$. These decays tend to be slow because they involve three heavy gauge bosons as in the process

$$\begin{aligned}(u,u,d) &\to (u,d) + \nu + J^{2/3} \to u + \nu + J^{2/3} + \nu + K^{-1/3} \\ &\to u + \nu + \nu + \bar{K}^{1/3} \to u + \bar{d} + \nu + \nu + \nu \to \pi^+ + \nu + \nu + \nu.\end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

The neutron has $f = 3$ and charge zero. Any state of three light neutrinos also has $f = 3$ and charge zero. So in the schemes of section V, a neutron inside a nucleus can decay into three neutrinos, $n \to 3\nu$. This decay also tends to be slow because it also involves three heavy gauge bosons as in the process

$$\begin{aligned}(u,d,d) &\to (d,d) + \nu + J^{2/3} \to d + \nu + \nu + J^{2/3} + K^{-1/3} \\ &\to d + \nu + \nu + \bar{K}^{1/3} \to \nu + \nu + \nu.\end{aligned} \tag{87}$$

If the masses of these heavy gauge bosons are M_J and M_K, then the lifetimes of the proton and of the nuclear neutron in these models are proportional to $m_J^8 m_K^4/(\alpha_u^4 m_p^{13})$ in which α_u is the fine-structure constant of the unified theory. A very rough estimate of the partial lifetime of the decay $n \to 3\nu$ is

$$\tau_n \sim 10^{30} \text{ years} \times \left(\frac{m_J^2 m_K}{(\text{PeV})^3}\right)^4 \frac{\alpha^2}{\alpha_u^4}. \tag{88}$$

The lower bounds on nucleon partial lifetimes are 4.9×10^{26} years for $n \to 3\nu$ [8], 5.8×10^{29} years for $n \to$ invisible [9], and 2.1×10^{29} years for $p \to$ invisible [10]. So the masses of the mediating gauge bosons J and K should exceed about a PeV. This energy scale is 9 or 10 orders of magnitude lower than the scale of traditional grand unification because these models don't put fermions and antifermions in the same multiplets. The running of masses and coupling constants poses less of a problem between 1 TeV and 10^3 TeV than between 1 TeV and 10^{12} TeV.

Neutron decay might be seen in the SNO, KamLAND, Super-Kamiokande, and JUNO detectors and may lurk in their recorded data. The decay of a nucleon in an ^{16}O nucleus would leave behind an excited ^{15}N* or ^{15}O* nucleus which 45% of the time emits a γ ray of 6–7 MeV [10]. In its ground state, an ^{15}O nucleus has a half-life of 122 s and decays into a stable nucleus of ^{15}N, a positron e^+, and a neutrino ν_e. The energy of the positron can be as high as 1.732 MeV with a mean energy of 735.28 keV [31].

The present model requires the existence of heavy mirror fermions with interactions much like those of the known fermions. They would form heavy positive nuclei surrounded by shells of heavy mirror electrons with $m_{e'} \gg m_e$. These mirror atoms would be very small with Bohr radii of the order of $(\alpha_u m_{e'})^{-1}$. The photon energy needed to excite these atoms would be of the order of $m_{e'}\alpha^2$, and so a photon would need an energy in excess of 100 MeV to excite one of these atoms. These atoms are candidates for dark matter. Because their masses would exceed 10 TeV, their number density would be about 1000 times lower than that of 10 GeV WIMPs. This low number density may be why physicists have not detected dark matter despite its energy density being 5.4 times greater than that of ordinary matter [11].

The primary and secondary fermions both interact through the gluons of $SU_c(3)$, so one might think that the nuclei of the heavy neutral atoms of the present model would interact strongly with those of ordinary matter. But nuclei scatter off other nuclei by exchanging pions, and the analog of a pion in heavy-nucleus–light-nucleus scattering is a WIMPy pion consisting of a light quark and a heavy antiquark or a light antiquark and a heavy quark. A WIMPy pion would have a mass in excess of 1 TeV and so the cross-section for heavy-nucleus–light-nucleus scattering would be like that of a weak interaction. The quarks of these putative dark-matter particles interact with QCD, but their interactions are of very short range because of the high masses of the exchanged heavy pions. Strongly interacting dark matter [12] broadens dark-matter cusps into cores [13], as suggested by some observations, and so may explain the apparent paucity of heavy dwarf galaxies around our galaxy [16].

Some mechanism—perhaps initial conditions or CP-violation—has created an excess of matter over antimatter and presumably of dark matter over dark antimatter. If dark matter is composed of heavy quarks and leptons, then the symmetry between the fermions and the mirror fermions may explain why the two excesses differ only by a factor of 5.4.

VII. SUMMARY

Although current research may change our understanding of gravity, I have assumed in this paper that the action of a fundamental theory should be invariant under general coordinate transformations so as to be compatible with general relativity. If this is so, then the standard model should be extended to one whose action is invariant under spatial reflection, which is a simple coordinate transformation. This paper describes such a model.

In the model, the mean value in the vacuum of a pseudoscalar field breaks parity. This field and a scalar Higgs field make the gauge bosons, the known fermions, and a set of mirror fermions suitably massive while avoiding flavor-changing neutral currents. When the model is applied to all three families with the same scalar h and pseudoscalar p fields, then some of the Yukawa coupling constants of the model exceed 4π. So the model in its present form should be regarded as an effective field theory. Because the action of the model is vector-like and invariant under spatial reflection, the theory conserves quark-plus-lepton number and has no anomalies and no strong-CP problem. The restoration of parity could occur at energies as low as 10 TeV. The model predicts heavy mirror fermions which form heavy neutral mirror atoms that are dark-matter candidates. The particle of the pseudoscalar field whose mean value breaks parity may be the 750-GeV diphoton resonance seen at CERN. In many grandly unified extensions of the model, the scale of grand unification can be as low as a PeV, and nucleons slowly decay into pions, antileptons, and neutrinos by processes like $p \to \pi^+ + 3\nu$, $p \to e^+ + 4\nu$, and $n \to 3\nu$ that conserve fermion number but violate baryon number minus lepton number.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I must thank Shashank Shalgar and Tim Tait for suggesting that effective field theories could make large coupling constants acceptable and that strongly interacting dark matter might turn galactic cusps into cores and help explain the paucity of local heavy dwarf galaxies. I wish to thank Jooyoung Lee for inviting me to the Korea Institute for Advanced Study where some of this paper was written. This work was advanced by conversations with Robert Cooper, Franco Giuliani, Raphael Gobat, Michael Gold, Gary Herling, Kurt Hinterbichler, C. W. Kim, John Matthews, and Anthony Zee, and by e-mail from Rouzbeh Allahverdi, Daniel Finley, Don Lichtenberg, and Howard Georgi.

---

[1] J. F. Plebanski, J. Math. Phys. **18**, 2511 (1977); A. Ashtekar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 2244 (1986); R. Capovilla, J. Dell, T. Jacobson, and L. Mason, Classical and Quantum Gravity **8**, 41 (1991); R. Capovilla, J. Dell, and T. Jacobson, Classical and Quantum Gravity **8**, 59 (1991); T. Jacobson and L. Smolin, Phys. Lett. **B196**, 39 (1987); Class. Quant. Grav. **5**,

583 (1988); L. Smolin, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 124017 (2009); S. Alexander, A. Marcianò, and L. Smolin, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 065017 (2014); M. Cortês, H. Gomes, and L. Smolin, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 043502 (2015); L. Smolin, Classical and Quantum Gravity **33**, 025011 (2016); K. Hinterbichler, Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**, 671 (2012), arXiv:1105.3735 [hep-th].

[2] T. P. T. Dijkstra, L. R. Huiszoon, and A. N. Schellekens, Nucl. Phys. **B710**, 3 (2005), arXiv:hep-th/0411129 [hep-th]; O. Lebedev, H. P. Nilles, S. Raby, S. Ramos-Sanchez, M. Ratz, P. K. S. Vaudrevange, and A. Wingerter, Phys. Lett. **B645**, 88 (2007), arXiv:hep-th/0611095 [hep-th].

[3] J. C. Pati and A. Salam, Phys. Rev. Lett. **31**, 661 (1973); Phys. Rev. D **10**, 275 (1974).

[4] H. Georgi and S. L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. Lett. **32**, 438 (1974).

[5] G. Aad *et al.* (ATLAS), JHEP **11**, 104 (2014), arXiv:1409.5500 [hep-ex].

[6] P. Achard *et al.* (L3), Phys. Lett. **B517**, 75 (2001), arXiv:hep-ex/0107015 [hep-ex].

[7] "Search for resonances in diphoton events with the ATLAS detector at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV," CERN technical report, ATLAS-CONF-2016-018 (2016); "Search for resonances decaying to photon pairs in 3.2 fb^{-1} of pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector," CERN technical report, ATLAS-CONF-2015-081 (2015).

[8] Y. Suzuki *et al.* (Kamiokande), Phys. Lett. **B311**, 357 (1993).

[9] T. Araki *et al.* (KamLAND), Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 101802 (2006), arXiv:hep-ex/0512059 [hep-ex].

[10] S. Ahmed *et al.* (SNO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 102004 (2004).

[11] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* (Planck), (2015), arXiv:1502.01589 [astro-ph.CO].

[12] K. K. Boddy, J. L. Feng, M. Kaplinghat, and T. M. P. Tait, Phys. Rev. **D89**, 115017 (2014), arXiv:1402.3629 [hep-ph].

[13] M. Rocha, A. H. G. Peter, J. S. Bullock, M. Kaplinghat, S. Garrison-Kimmel, J. Onorbe, and L. A. Moustakas, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **430**, 81 (2013), arXiv:1208.3025 [astro-ph.CO]; M. Vogelsberger, J. Zavala, and A. Loeb, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **423**, 3740 (2012), arXiv:1201.5892 [astro-ph.CO].

[14] A. B. Newman, T. Treu, R. S. Ellis, and D. J. Sand, Astrophys. J. **765**, 25 (2013), arXiv:1209.1392 [astro-ph.CO].

[15] S.-H. Oh, C. Brook, F. Governato, E. Brinks, L. Mayer, W. J. G. de Blok, A. Brooks, and F. Walter, Astron. J. **142**, 24 (2011), arXiv:1011.2777 [astro-ph.CO].

[16] M. Boylan-Kolchin, J. S. Bullock, and M. Kaplinghat, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **415**, L40 (2011), arXiv:1103.0007 [astro-ph.CO]; J. Zavala, M. Vogelsberger, and M. G. Walker, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society: Letters **431**, L20 (2013), arXiv:1211.6426 [astro-ph.CO].

[17] I. Montvay, Phys. Lett. **B199**, 89 (1987); Phys. Lett. **B205**, 315 (1988); F. Csikor and I. Montvay, Phys. Lett. **B231**, 503 (1989); L. Lin, G. Munster, M. Plagge, I. Montvay, H. Wittig, C. Frick, and T. Trappenberg, *The International Symposium on Lattice Field Theory: Lattice 92 Amsterdam, Netherlands, September 15-19, 1992*, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **30**, 647 (1993), arXiv:hep-lat/9212015 [hep-lat]; F. Csikor and I. Montvay, Phys. Lett. **B324**, 412 (1994), arXiv:hep-ph/9401290 [hep-ph]; J. Maalampi, K. Mursula, and M. Roos, Nucl. Phys. **B207**, 233 (1982); J. Maalampi and M. Roos, Phys. Rept. **186**, 53 (1990); M. Creutz and I. Horváth, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 2297 (1994); M. J. Dugan and L. Randall, Phys. Lett. **B264**, 154 (1991); Nucl. Phys. **B382**, 419 (1992).

[18] M. M. Anber, U. Aydemir, J. F. Donoghue, and P. Pais, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 015012 (2009).

[19] S. A. Ellis, R. M. Godbole, S. Gopalakrishna, and J. D. Wells, JHEP **1409**, 130 (2014); S. Raby and A. Wingerter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 051802 (2007), arXiv:0705.0294 [hep-ph]; B. A. Dobrescu and C. T. Hill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 2634 (1998), arXiv:hep-ph/9712319 [hep-ph]; R. S. Chivukula, B. A. Dobrescu, H. Georgi, and C. T. Hill, Phys. Rev. **D59**, 075003 (1999), arXiv:hep-ph/9809470 [hep-ph]; H.-J. He, T. M. P. Tait, and C. P. Yuan, Phys. Rev. **D62**, 011702 (2000), arXiv:hep-ph/9911266 [hep-ph]; S. Gopalakrishna, T. Mandal, S. Mitra, and G. Moreau, JHEP **08**, 079 (2014), arXiv:1306.2656 [hep-ph]; R. Contino, L. Da Rold, and A. Pomarol, Phys. Rev. **D75**, 055014 (2007), arXiv:hep-ph/0612048 [hep-ph]; C. Anastasiou, E. Furlan, and J. Santiago, Phys. Rev. **D79**, 075003 (2009), arXiv:0901.2117 [hep-ph]; N. Vignaroli, JHEP **07**, 158 (2012), arXiv:1204.0468 [hep-ph]; A. De Simone, O. Matsedonskyi, R. Rattazzi, and A. Wulzer, JHEP **04**, 004 (2013), arXiv:1211.5663 [hep-ph]; C. Delaunay, C. Grojean, and G. Perez, JHEP **09**, 090 (2013), arXiv:1303.5701 [hep-ph]; M. Gillioz, R. GrÃűber, A. Kapuvari, and M. MÃijhlleitner, JHEP **03**, 037 (2014), arXiv:1311.4453 [hep-ph]; T. Han, H. E. Logan, B. McElrath, and L.-T. Wang, Phys. Rev. **D67**, 095004 (2003), arXiv:hep-ph/0301040 [hep-ph]; M. Carena, J. Hubisz, M. Perelstein, and P. Verdier, Phys. Rev. **D75**, 091701 (2007), arXiv:hep-ph/0610156 [hep-ph]; S. Matsumoto, T. Moroi, and K. Tobe, Phys. Rev. **D78**, 055018 (2008), arXiv:0806.3837 [hep-ph]; J. Berger, J. Hubisz, and

M. Perelstein, JHEP **07**, 016 (2012), arXiv:1205.0013 [hep-ph]; J. Kang, P. Langacker, and B. D. Nelson, Phys. Rev. **D77**, 035003 (2008), arXiv:0708.2701 [hep-ph]; S. P. Martin, Phys. Rev. **D81**, 035004 (2010), arXiv:0910.2732 [hep-ph]; P. W. Graham, A. Ismail, S. Rajendran, and P. Saraswat, Phys. Rev. **D81**, 055016 (2010), arXiv:0910.3020 [hep-ph]; S. P. Martin, Phys. Rev. **D82**, 055019 (2010), arXiv:1006.4186 [hep-ph]; S. P. Martin and J. D. Wells, Phys. Rev. **D86**, 035017 (2012), arXiv:1206.2956 [hep-ph]; W. Fischler and W. Tangarife, JHEP **05**, 151 (2014), arXiv:1310.6369 [hep-ph]; M. Endo, K. Hamaguchi, S. Iwamoto, and N. Yokozaki, Phys. Rev. **D85**, 095012 (2012), arXiv:1112.5653 [hep-ph]; M. Endo, K. Hamaguchi, K. Ishikawa, S. Iwamoto, and N. Yokozaki, JHEP **01**, 181 (2013), arXiv:1212.3935 [hep-ph].

[20] C. Vafa and E. Witten, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53**, 535 (1984).

[21] C. Vafa and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B234**, 173 (1984).

[22] S. Aoki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 3136 (1986); Nucl. Phys. **B314**, 79 (1989); S. Aoki and A. Gocksch, Phys. Rev. D **45**, 3845 (1992).

[23] R. Utiyama, Phys. Rev. **101(5)**, 1597 (1956).

[24] T. W. B. Kibble, J. Math. Phys. **2(2)**, 212 (1961).

[25] S. Weinberg, "Gravitation and cosmology," (John Wiley & Sons, 1972) Chap. 12.5.

[26] S. Weinberg, "The quantum theory of fields," (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1995) Chap. 5.5.

[27] H. Logan, "Tasi 2013 lectures on higgs physics within and beyond the standard model," (2014), arXiv:1406.1786 [hep-ph].

[28] K. Cahill, "*Physical Mathematics*," (Cambridge University Press, 2013) pp. 55–63.

[29] R. A. Porto and A. Zee, Phys. Lett. **B666**, 491 (2008), arXiv:0712.0448 [hep-ph]; Phys. Rev. **D79**, 013003 (2009), arXiv:0807.0612 [hep-ph]; Y. BenTov and A. Zee, Nucl. Phys. **B871**, 452 (2013), arXiv:1202.4234 [hep-ph]; Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A28**, 1350149 (2013), arXiv:1207.0467 [hep-ph].

[30] Y. BenTov and A. Zee, (2015), arXiv:1505.04312 [hep-th]; C. H. Albright, R. P. Feger, and T. W. Kephart, Phys. Rev. **D93**, 075032 (2016), arXiv:1601.07523 [hep-ph].

[31] F. Ajzenberg-selove, Nucl. Phys. A **523**, 1 (1991), www.nndc.bnl.gov/chart.